

## Remarks

The forgoing amendment has been made after a careful review of the present application, the references of record, and the Elections/Restriction Requirement issued May 26, 2004. In the Election/Restriction Requirement the examiner has divided the claims of the application into three species, number 1 being claims 8 and 9, number 2 being claims 1 through 7, and number 3 being claim 10. The examiner asserted that claims 8 and 9 are generic.

In the forgoing amendment the applicant substituted the word "wherein" for the word "whereby" where used in the claims because the word "wherein" is considered to have more meaning than the word "whereby" in construction of claims.

In compliance with the Election Requirement, the applicant hereby elects to prosecute species 3, that being claim 10.

Notwithstanding the forgoing Election, the applicant believes and asserts that claim 10 is generic with regard to all the other independent claims. The fundamental element of the present invention is a device which circumvents the one-way clutch which is commonly provided in existing multi-speed bicycles. The one-way clutch of the bicycle prevents the application of rotational force from the rear wheel to the crankshaft and pedals of the bicycle, and allows the rider to coast with his feet on the pedals and the crankshaft stationary. By avoiding the one-way clutch, the rider can use his legs and feet to stop the bicycle. Claim 10 recites the elements of the bicycle plus a means for applying rotational force from the rear wheel to the crankshaft while the rear wheel is rotating in the first (forward) direction, and a clutch for engaging the

device. Any of the described embodiments of the invention causes force from the forwardly rotating rear wheel to be applied to the pedals and by resisting that force with his feet, the rider can stop the bicycle. Claims 1, 7, and 8 all define structures which cause the transfer of force from the rotating rear wheel to the pedals where they can be resisted by the rider. The structure of claims 1, 7, and 8 are therefore all "means for applying rotational force from said rear wheel to said crankshaft while said rear wheel is rotating in said first direction."

With respect to claim 9, the applicant states that where there is a "means for applying rotational force from said crankshaft to said axle in a second direction," as is recited in claim 9, there is an equal and opposite force applied by the axle to the crankshaft. Claim 9 is in many respects a mirror image of claim 10.

In view of the forgoing, the applicant submits that claim 10 is a generic claim.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert L. Marsh  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 25894  
630-681-7500  
630-681-3464 (fax)

RLM:ksc